REMARKS

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Marsh.

Davis and Marsh do not teach or suggest a plurality of selectable options with an information delivery process associated with each selectable option and receiving a selected piece of information from the user depending on the selectable option selected by the user.

Davis, in this regard, teaches a method for monitoring client interaction with a resource downloaded from a server in a computer network (Abstract). When a user is exposed to an ad banner having information targeted to their particular interests, the user is more likely to interact with that ad banner for a longer period of time (col. 14, lines 1-4). An ad banner may include specific information permitting the user to interact in different ways with the banner. The ad banner may have pull-down menu options, clickable buttons or "hot-spots", keyboard input, or any number of input mechanisms, whose selection or action upon in a designated manner causes corresponding events to take place in the ad banner such as the generation or synthesis of sounds, the display of images, video, or graphic animations, or the presentation of different types of information to the user, perhaps with additional choices (col. 14, lines 7-16). Such information may, for example, include links to interactive games, links to entertainment information, sports-related games and/or trivia, and the like, or

information concerning particular goods and services, or means by which to order or purchase specific goods and services (col. 14, lines 16-21).

Davis thus teaches one information delivery process through the display of information through an interactive ad banner. Davis makes no mention of multiple information delivery processes. Specifically, Davis does not teach or suggest a plurality of selectable options with an information delivery process associated with each selectable option and receiving a selected piece of information from the user depending on the selectable option selected by the user.

Marsh, in this regard, teaches a method for scheduling the presentation of a continuously-changing display to computer users, which is particularly well suited for use in an advertisement-supported email service (Abstract). As illustrated in Fig. 4, a banner advertisement 601 may be displayed within a display terminal monitor 208. The banner advertisement 601 may be interactive. For example, by clicking on a specified portion of the banner advertisement 601, the user may be provided with additional information concerning the subject matter of the banner advertisement 601 (col. 7, lines 53-57). Likewise, the user may access an email message template including the email address of a vendor associated with the banner advertisement 601 being displayed, so that the user may easily forward comments or requests for additional information (col. 7, lines 57-61). Clicking on the banner advertisement 601 may also cause an email

message to be automatically completed and either transmitted immediately to the vendor or stored in an "outbox" for later transmission (col. 7, lines 61-65).

Marsh makes no mention of having multiple delivery processes and receiving differing sorts of information for each delivery process. Specifically, Marsh does not teach or suggest a plurality of selectable options with an information delivery process associated with each selectable option and receiving a selected piece of information from the user depending on the selectable option selected by the user.

Claims 1, 17, 21, 25, 26, and 27 have been amended to include a plurality of selectable options with an information delivery process associated with each selectable option and receiving a selected piece of information from the user depending on the selectable option selected by the user.

Specifically, claim 1 includes the limitations "a plurality of associated selectable options that are displayed when said advertisement is displayed, further wherein each of said plurality of selectable options has an associated information delivery process" and "receiving an input from the user identifying where information is to be sent, the input differing depending on the selection made."

Claim 17 includes the limitation "wherein said displayable item has at least two associated selectable options and each of said two selectable options has an associated information delivery process" and "receiving an input from the

user identifying where information is to be sent, the input differing depending on the selection made."

Claim 21 includes the limitation "a plurality of associated selectable options, further wherein each of said plurality of selectable options has an associated information delivery process" and "receiving an input from the user identifying where information is to be sent, the input differing depending on the selection made."

Claim 25 includes the limitation "a plurality of associated selectable options, further wherein each of said plurality of selectable options has an associated information delivery process" and "receiving an input from the user identifying where information is to be sent, the input differing depending on the selection made."

Claim 26 includes the limitation "a plurality of associated selectable options that are displayed when said advertisement is displayed, further wherein each of said plurality of selectable options has an associated information delivery process" and "means for receiving an input from the user identifying where information is to be sent, the input differing depending on the selection made."

Claim 27 includes the limitation "wherein said displayable item has at least two associated selectable options and each of said two selectable options has an associated information delivery process" and "computer program means

for receiving an input from the user identifying where information is to be sent, the input differing depending on the selection made."

Therefore, claims 1, 17, 21, 25, 26, and 27 are patentable over Davis in view of Marsh because claims 1, 17, 21, 25, 26, and 27 include limitations that are not taught or suggested by Davis and Marsh.

Claims 2-16, 18-20, and 22-24 are dependent on either claims 1, 17, or claim 21 and should be allowable for the same reasons as claims 1, 17, and 21 stated above.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Marsh.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Stephen M. De Klerk at (408) 720-8300.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), Applicant hereby requests and authorizes the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: June 13, 2005

Mark A. Kupanoff
Reg. No. 55,349

Customer No. 008791
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300